arXiv:1603.08808v2 [math.NT] 11 Jan 2017

CUBIC APPROXIMATION TO STURMIAN CONTINUED FRACTIONS

JOHANNES SCHLEISCHITZ

Abstract. We determine the classical exponents of approximation $w_3(\zeta), w_3^*(\zeta), \lambda_3(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_3(\zeta), \widehat{w}_3^*(\zeta), \widehat{\lambda}_3(\zeta)$ associated to real numbers ζ whose continued fraction expansions are given by a Sturmian word. We more generally provide a description of the combined graph of the parametric successive minima functions defined by Schmidt and Summerer in dimension three for such Sturmian continued fractions. This both complements similar results due to Bugeaud and Laurent concerning the two-dimensional exponents and generalizes a recent result of the author. As a side result we obtain new information on the spectra of the above exponents. Moreover, we provide some information on the exponents $\lambda_n(\zeta)$ for a Sturmian continued fraction ζ and arbitrary n.

Keywords: geometry of numbers, continued fractions, Sturmian words
Math Subject Classification 2010: 11H06, 11J13, 11J70

1. Exponents of approximation and Sturmian continued fractions

We start with the definition of classical exponents of Diophantine approximation. Let ζ be a real transcendental number and $n \geq 1$ be an integer. For a polynomial $P(T) = a_n T^n + a_{n-1}T^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0$, as usual denote by $H(P) = \max_{0\leq j\leq n} |a_j|$ its naive height. Let $w_n(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_n(\zeta)$ be the supremum of $w \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the system

$$H(P) \leq X, \qquad 0 < |P(\zeta)| \leq X^{-w}, \tag{1}$$

has a non-zero polynomial solution $P(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n for arbitrarily large X, and all large X, respectively. For fixed ζ, the sequences $(w_n(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\widehat{w}_n(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ are obviously non-decreasing as n increases. Dirichlet's Theorem implies the lower bounds

$$w_n(\zeta) \geq \widehat{w}_n(\zeta) \geq n. \tag{2}$$

Following Bugeaud and Laurent [5], we define the exponents of simultaneous approximation $\lambda_n(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_n(\zeta)$ as the supremum of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the system

$$1 \leq |x| \leq X, \qquad \max_{1\leq i\leq n} |\zeta^i x - y_i| \leq X^{-\lambda}, \tag{3}$$

has a solution $(x, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ for arbitrarily large values of X, and all large X, respectively. In contrast to the polynomial exponents, $(\lambda_n(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\widehat{\lambda}_n(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ clearly

Research supported by the Schrödinger scholarship J 3824 of the Austrian Science Fund FWF.
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, Canada
johannes.schleischitz@univie.ac.at.

form non-increasing sequences, as the number of estimates that need to be satisfied in (3) grows with n. Another version of Dirichlet's Theorem yields

$$\lambda_n(\zeta) \geq \widehat{\lambda}_n(\zeta) \geq \frac{1}{n}, \tag{4}$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and transcendental real ζ. Khintchine [12] established the connection

$$\frac{w_n(\zeta)}{(n-1)w_n(\zeta)+n} \leq \lambda_n(\zeta) \leq \frac{w_n(\zeta)-n+1}{n}. \tag{5}$$

Finally we define the quantities $w_n^*(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_n^*(\zeta)$. For α an algebraic number, we put $H(\alpha) = H(P)$ for P its (up to sign) unique minimal polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ with coprime coefficients, and call $H(\alpha)$ the height of α. Then $w_n^*(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_n^*(\zeta)$ are given as the supremum of real w^* such that

$$H(\alpha) \leq X, \qquad 0 < |\alpha - \zeta| \leq H(\alpha)^{-1} X^{-w^*}$$

has an algebraic real solution α of degree at most n for arbitrarily large X, and all large X, respectively. For $n = 1$, it is not hard to see that $w_1(\zeta) = \lambda_1(\zeta) = w_1^*(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_1(\zeta) = \widehat{\lambda}_1(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_1^*(\zeta) = 1$. Clearly again the definition of the exponents directly imply that the sequences $(w_n^*(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\widehat{w}_n^*(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ are non-decreasing. It is further known that

$$w_n^*(\zeta) \leq w_n(\zeta) \leq w_n^*(\zeta) + n - 1, \qquad \widehat{w}_n^*(\zeta) \leq \widehat{w}_n(\zeta) \leq \widehat{w}_n^*(\zeta) + n - 1 \tag{6}$$

hold for all integers $n \geq 1$ and any transcendental real ζ, see [2, Lemma A.8]. Roughly speaking the usual case is equality in the respective left inequalities of (6). Otherwise, in case of strict inequality, for all polynomials with very small absolute values of evaluations at ζ (inducing $w_n(\zeta)$) the derivatives at ζ are untypically small by absolute value. On the other hand, it is known that $w_n(\zeta) - w_n^*(\zeta)$ takes any value in the interval $[0, n/2 + (n-2)/(4(n-1))]$ for some real transcendental ζ, and for $n \in \{2, 3\}$ any value in the allowed interval $[0, n-1]$, see [4]. We will discuss certain spectra for $n = 3$ in Section 2.2.

We follow the definition of Sturmian words in [5, Section 3] and enclose certain properties that are of importance for us. Let $(s_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers and for fixed distinct positive integers a, b consider the words recursively defined by

$$m_0 = b, \quad m_1 = b^{s_1-1}a, \quad m_{k+1} = m_k^{s_{k+1}} m_{k-1}, \qquad k \geq 1. \tag{7}$$

Let

$$\varphi = [0; s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots], \qquad m_\varphi = \lim_{k\to\infty} m_k = b^{s_1-1}a \cdots . \tag{8}$$

Denote by $\zeta_\varphi = [0; m_\varphi]$ the number whose continued fraction expansion is given by concatenation of 0 and m_φ and let

$$\sigma_\varphi = \liminf_{k\to\infty} [0; s_k, s_{k-1}, \ldots, s_1] = \frac{1}{\limsup_{k\to\infty} [s_k; s_{k-1}, \ldots, s_1]}. \tag{9}$$

Throughout the paper let

$$\gamma = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.6180$$

be the golden ratio. We shall also implicitly consider fixed distinct positive integers a, b whenever words φ are involved in accordance with the above definitions. As in [5] denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the set of values σ arising in this way. It is not hard to see that $\mathcal{S}$ forms a subset of $[0, \gamma^{-1}]$. The set $\mathcal{S}$ has countable intersection with interval $[s, \gamma^{-1}]$, where $s \approx 0.3867$ is the largest accumulation point of $\mathcal{S}$, but as shown in [5, Theorem 8.2] for any $s' < s$ the interval $[s', s]$ has uncountable intersection with $\mathcal{S}$. On the other hand, as pointed out in the Remark on page 27 in [5], any interval contained in $[0, s]$ contains a subinterval which has empty intersection with $\mathcal{S}$. For more information on the set $\mathcal{S}$ and the continued fraction expansion of the value s see [5, Section 8] and also Cassaigne [7] and Fischler [9], [10]. In the special case of a constant sequence $(s_k)_{k\geq 1}$ equal to one, the corresponding Sturmian continued fractions satisfy $\sigma_\varphi = \gamma^{-1} = \gamma - 1$ and the arising numbers $\zeta_\varphi = \zeta_{\gamma-1}$ provide examples of extremal numbers defined by Roy [14]. Extremal numbers attain simultaneously the maximum possible values $\widehat{w}_2(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_2^*(\zeta) = \gamma + 1$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_2(\zeta) = \gamma - 1$ among real ζ which are not rational or quadratic irrational. However, Roy [15, Theorem 2.4] proved the existence of extremal numbers for which no birational equivalent number has continued fraction expansion given by a Sturmian word (observe that birational transformations $\zeta \to (a\zeta + b)/(c\zeta + d)$ for $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $ad - bc \neq 0$ do not affect the classical exponents).

The classical exponents of Diophantine approximation of the Sturmian continued fractions above in dimension $n = 2$ have been established by Bugeaud and Laurent [5]. The central result of their paper is the following [5, Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 1.1 (Bugeaud, Laurent)**.** *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ with corresponding $\sigma = \sigma_\varphi$ be as above. Then*

$$\lambda_2(\zeta) = 1, \qquad w_2(\zeta) = w_2^*(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}$$
$$\widehat{\lambda}_2(\zeta) = \frac{1+\sigma}{2+\sigma}, \qquad \widehat{w}_2(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_2^*(\zeta) = 2 + \sigma.$$

The goal of this paper is to determine the exponents for $n = 3$.

2. The main new results

2.1. **Exponents is dimension three.** The main result of the paper is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ be a Sturmian continued fraction with corresponding $\sigma = \sigma_\varphi$ as above. Then*

$$w_3(\zeta) = w_3^*(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}, \qquad \lambda_3(\zeta) = \frac{1}{1+2\sigma}, \tag{10}$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_3(\zeta) = 3, \qquad \widehat{\lambda}_3(\zeta) = \frac{1}{3}, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_3^*(\zeta) = 2 + \sigma. \tag{12}$$

For $\sigma = \gamma^{-1}$ we obtain the results for extremal numbers of [17, Theorem 2.1], apart from the new claims for w_3^* and $\widehat{w}_3^*$. The proof of Theorem 2.1 will lead to the following generalization of [17, Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ with corresponding $\sigma = \sigma_\varphi$ be as above and $\epsilon > 0$. Then*

$$|Q(\zeta)| \le H(Q)^{-3-\epsilon} \tag{13}$$

has only finitely many irreducible solutions $Q \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree precisely three. In particular

$$|\zeta - \alpha| \le H(\alpha)^{-4-\epsilon} \tag{14}$$

has only finitely many algebraic solutions α of degree precisely three. On the other hand, the inequalities

$$|Q(\zeta)| \le H(Q)^{-3+\epsilon}, \qquad |\zeta - \alpha| \le H(\alpha)^{-4+\epsilon} \tag{15}$$

have solutions in irreducible polynomials P and algebraic numbers α of degree precisely three respectively, for arbitrarily large $H(Q)$ and $H(\alpha)$. Moreover, there exist arbitrarily large values of X such that

$$H(Q) \le X, \qquad |Q(\zeta)| \le X^{-2\sigma-1-\epsilon} \tag{16}$$

has no irreducible solution $Q \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree precisely three. Consequently, for arbitrarily large values of X the system

$$H(\alpha) \le X, \qquad |\zeta - \alpha| \le H(\alpha)^{-1} X^{-2\sigma-1-\epsilon} \tag{17}$$

admits no solution in α an algebraic number of degree precisely three.

As in [17] we strongly expect that the exponents in (16) and (17) are optimal as well. See the comments below the proof of [17, Theorem 2.2] for a heuristic argument that supports this belief, which can be adapted to our situation. Moreover, it should actually be possible to deduce from the proof that the ϵ in the exponents can be replaced by a multiplicative constant throughout. We do not carry this out.

Finally we discuss the quantities $\lambda_n(\zeta_\varphi)$ for $n > 3$. We will establish lower estimates for $\lambda_n(\zeta_\varphi)$ for $n > 3$. The proof will be rather simple and only relies on the knowledge of the value of $w_2(\zeta_\varphi)$ from Theorem 1.1 and duality arguments. Moreover, from recent results in [22] we deduce an upper bound for sufficiently large n.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ with corresponding $\sigma = \sigma_\varphi$ and $n \ge 3$ be an integer. Then*

$$\frac{1}{1+2\sigma} \ge \lambda_n(\zeta) \ge \frac{2+(3-n)\sigma}{2+(n+1)\sigma}. \tag{18}$$

In particular, if and only if $\sigma = 0$ we have

$$\lambda_n(\zeta) = 1, \qquad n \ge 1. \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, if $\sigma > 0$, for $n \ge 2 + \lceil \frac{2}{\sigma} \rceil$ we have

$$\lambda_n(\zeta) \le \frac{1}{2+\sigma} < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{20}$$

For $n = 3$ the lower bound in (18) becomes the precise value from Theorem 2.1, but notice there is no equality for $n = 2$. Also there is no reason to believe in equality for any Sturmian continued fraction and any $n \geq 4$. A better bound for $n = 4$ and ζ an extremal number was established in [17, Theorem 2.3]. In the deduction the identity $\gamma^2 - \gamma - 1 = 0$ for the golden ratio $\widehat{w}_2(\zeta) - 1 = \gamma$ was essential. For general Sturmian continued fractions ζ_φ this kind of argument seems no longer to work. In particular, there is no reason for the equality in the right transference inequality of (5) supposed to hold for $n = 4$ and extremal numbers, see the proof of [17, Theorem 2.3], to extend to more general Sturmian continued fractions. The lower bound in (18) is of interest only for n not too large, unless $\sigma = 0$. Indeed, in case of $\sigma > 0$, for $n > 1 + 2/\sigma$ it is even worse then the trivial bounds from (4). Notice also that numbers with the property (19) were constructed in [3, Theorem 4] by a similar word concatenation argument. We notice that for ζ an extremal number, the estimate (20) leads to the new information

$$\lambda_6(\zeta) \leq \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 0.3820.$$

The right hand side value is smaller than the trivial bound $\lambda_6(\zeta) \leq \lambda_3(\zeta) = 1/\sqrt{5} \approx 0.4472$ from Theorem 2.1, however it is considerably larger than the expected value $(\sqrt{5}-1)/4 \approx 0.3090$ for $\lambda_4(\zeta)$, see [17, Theorem 2.3] and the enclosed comments. Eventually, inspired by (19) and (20), we pose the problem whether the sequence $(\lambda_n(\zeta_\varphi))_{n\geq 1}$ tends to 0 necessarily when ζ_φ is a Sturmian continued fraction with $\sigma_\varphi > 0$.

2.2. **Spectra.** We display immediate consequences of Theorem 2.1 concerning the spectra of certain approximation constants. Following [5] we define the spectrum of an exponent of approximation as the set of real values obtained as ζ runs through the real transcendental numbers. For convenience we will write spec(.), for example spec(λ_3). Recall $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and its properties from Section 1. For a definition of Hausdorff dimension see [8].

Corollary 2.4. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, the sets*

$$\mathrm{spec}(\lambda_3) \cap [1 - \epsilon, 1], \quad \mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*) \cap [2, 2 + \epsilon], \quad \mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3 - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*) \cap [1 - \epsilon, 1]$$

all have Hausdorff dimension 1. *Moreover the points $1/(2s + 1), 2 + s$ and $1 - s$ are accumulation points of* $\mathrm{spec}(\lambda_3), \mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*)$ *and* $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3 - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*)$ *respectively.*

Proof. Theorem 2.1 shows that any $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ gives rise to a point $1/(2s' + 1)$ in spec(λ_3), a point $2 + s'$ in spec($\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*$) and a point $1 - s'$ in spec($\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3 - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*$). On the other hand, as essentially shown in [5], the characterization of the set $\mathcal{S}$ that its intersection with $[0, \epsilon)$ has full dimension. Indeed the reciprocal of any number with continued fraction expansion of the form $[K; a_1, a_2, \cdots]$ with all $a_j < K$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}$ as remarked in [5, page 27]. These elements obviously tend to 0 as $K \to \infty$. On the other hand, as remarked in [5, page 27], Jarník showed that the dimension of the implied sets tends to 1 as $K \to \infty$. Thus the metrical results follow from the invariance of Hausdorff dimensions under Lipschitz continuous maps. The given points are accumulation points since s is an accumulation points of $\mathcal{S}$. □

We expect that $\mathrm{spec}(\lambda_3)$ equals the entire interval $[1/3, \infty]$. This is [3, Problem 1] for $n = 3$. However, only the interval $[1, \infty]$ is known to be included and corresponding ζ can be constructed, as first noticed by Bugeaud [3, Theorem 2]. In this interval the numbers ζ can even be chosen in the Cantor middle third set, see [18, Theorem 4.4] and the more general [20, Theorem 2.9]. Moreover the Hausdorff dimensions of $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda_3(\zeta) = t\}$ for a prescribed value $t \in [1, \infty]$ are known [18, Corollary 1.8]. On the other hand very little is known about the remaining interval $[1/3, 1)$. In fact the first explicit constructions of numbers with prescribed value of $\lambda_n(\zeta) < 1$ for any $n \geq 2$ seem to be extremal numbers ζ in [17], and $n = 3$. The spectrum of $\widehat{w}_3^*$ is also supposed to contain the interval $[1, 3]$ and $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3 - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*)$ to equal the entire interval $[0, 2]$ in which it is contained according to the restriction (6). However, none of these conjectures has been proved. However, as pointed out to me by Y. Bugeaud, it can be deduced from combination of [3, Corollary 1] and [6, Theorem 2.2] with $m = 1$ that $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathrm{n}}^*)$ contains $[1, 2 - 1/n]$ and $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathrm{n}} - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathrm{n}}^*)$ contains $[n - 2 + 1/n, n - 1]$, for all $n \geq 2$. The method shows that a sufficient criterion for the conjectures above is that numbers ζ with the property

$$w_1(\zeta) = w_2(\zeta) = \cdots = w_n(\zeta) = w$$

exist for all $w \geq n$. This is only known for $w \geq 2n - 1$. Finally we want to investigate the consequences of Theorem 2.1 to $\mathrm{spec}(\mathrm{w}_3)$. A metric result of Bernik [1] implies $\mathrm{spec}(\mathrm{w}_3) = [3, \infty]$. However, the numbers ζ_φ with σ sufficiently close to $\gamma^{-1} = \gamma - 1$ provide the first explicit constructions of transcendental real numbers with $w_3(\zeta) \in (3, 5)$. On the other hand the subset of $\mathrm{spec}(\mathrm{w}_3)$ induced by some ζ_φ intersected with $(3, 5)$ consists only of $\{2 + \sqrt{5}, 2 + 2\sqrt{2}\}$ and is induced by only countably many ζ_φ, as a closer look at the largest few elements of $\mathcal{S}$ shows, see again [5, page 27]. For the remaining interval $[5, \infty]$ the construction of Bugeaud [3, Corollary 1] indicated above applies and yields uncountably many ζ with prescribed value $w_3(\zeta)$.

We want to point out that Roy [16] proved that $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_2)$ is dense in $[2, \gamma + 1]$, which by Jarníks identity [11] also shows that $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\lambda}_2)$ is dense in $[1/2, \gamma - 1]$. Roy constructed suitable numbers ζ in a class he called of Fibonacci type [16, Section 7], which share many properties with Sturmian continued fractions but provide a more general concept. It would be interesting to investigate if Theorem 2.1 can be generalized to the corresponding numbers ζ to deduce the density of $\mathrm{spec}(\lambda_3), \mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3)$ and $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3 - \widehat{\mathrm{w}}_3^*)$ in the resulting intervals $[1/\sqrt{5}, 1], [2, 1 + \gamma]$ and $[2 - \gamma, 1]$ respectively. We finally remark that $\mathrm{spec}(\widehat{\mathrm{w}}_2)$ has countable intersection with $[c, \gamma + 1]$ for some $c < \gamma + 1$, in particular it is a proper subset of $[2, \gamma + 1]$.

3. Determination of the uniform exponents

3.1. **Proof of** (11)**.** The main ingredient for the proof of Theorem 2.1 will be the following Theorem 3.1, which is stated in a more general form then needed in our applications. Roughly speaking it claims that if $w_{n-1}(\zeta) = n-1$ and moreover there are infinitely many pairs of polynomials $P, Q \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree n whose heights do not differ too much and both $|P(\zeta)|$ and $|Q(\zeta)|$ are very small, then $\widehat{w}_{2n-1}(\zeta) = 2n-1$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{2n-1}(\zeta) = 1/(2n-1)$. This looks somehow exotic at first sight, but if $n = 2$ and $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ the assumptions will

be satisfied as can be inferred from results in [5]. In particular the claim (11) will follow as a direct consequence of the results in [5] combined with Theorem 3.1 below, as we will show in this section. This is also an intermediate step for the proof of (10), however the deduction requires additional technical arguments involving parametric geometry of numbers, very similar to the proof of [17, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and ζ be a real number. Assume $w_{n-1}(\zeta) = n-1$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. Assume there exist (not necessarily disjoint) sequences of polynomials $(P_i)_{i\geq 1}$ and $(Q_i)_{i\geq 1}$ in $\mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n with the following properties:*

- *$\{P_i, Q_i\}$ is linearly independent for $i \geq 1$*
- *$H(P_1) < H(P_2) < \cdots$ and $H(Q_1) < H(Q_2) < \cdots$*
- *$H(P_i) < H(Q_i)$ for $i \geq 1$*
- *For large $i \geq i_0(\epsilon)$ we have*

$$|P_i(\zeta)| \leq H(P_i)^{-2n+1+\epsilon}, \qquad |Q_i(\zeta)| \leq H(Q_i)^{-2n+1+\epsilon}, \tag{21}$$

- *if μ_i and $\nu_i \in (0,1]$ are defined by*

$$|P_i(\zeta)| = H(P_i)^{-\mu_i}, \qquad H(Q_i)^{\nu_i} = H(P_i)$$

then for large $i \geq i_1(\epsilon)$ we have

$$\frac{n}{\nu_i(\mu_i - n + 1)} < 1 + \epsilon. \tag{22}$$

Then for large $i \geq i_2(\epsilon)$ and the parameter $X_i = H(Q_i)$ the system

$$H(P) \leq X_i, \qquad |P(\zeta)| \leq X_i^{-2n+1-\epsilon} \tag{23}$$

has no non-trivial solution $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most $2n-1$. In particular

$$\widehat{w}_{2n-1}(\zeta) = 2n-1, \qquad \widehat{\lambda}_{2n-1}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2n-1}. \tag{24}$$

Remark 3.2. It is possible to weaken the assumptions by prescribing an upper bound less than $2n-1$ for $w_{n-1}(\zeta)$ and/or replacing the right hand side in (22) by a larger number, to obtain upper bounds for $\widehat{w}_{2n-1}(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{2n-1}(\zeta)$. We do not carry this out.

We will now carry out how to apply Theorem 3.1 to Sturmian words $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ and $n = 2$ to deduce (11). The method generalizes the proof of [17, (12) in Theorem 2.1] and leads to a deeper insight why it is true. We have to check that the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied in this context. This follows from certain results due to Bugeaud and Laurent [5]. First we introduce some more notation. Let ζ_φ be defined as in (8) via a sequence $(s_k)_{k\geq 1}$ and let $(m_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be the corresponding words as in (7). Then for $k \geq 1$ let

$$\eta_k := [s_{k+1}; s_k, \ldots, s_1], \qquad \alpha_k := [0; m_k, m_k, \ldots]. \tag{25}$$

Every α_k is a quadratic irrational number. Let W_k denote its minimal polynomial over $\mathbb{Z}[T]$ with coprime coefficients and let $H(\alpha_k) = H(W_k)$. Concretely the following was shown in the proofs of [5, Corollary 6.1 and Corollary 6.2]. As usual $a \asymp b$ means both $a \ll b$ and $b \ll a$ are satisfied everywhere it occurs in the sequel.

Lemma 3.3 (Bugeaud, Laurent)**.** *Let ζ_φ be as above. Then*

$$|\zeta_\varphi - \alpha_k| \asymp H(\alpha_k)^{-2-2\eta_k}, \tag{26}$$

and

$$|W_k(\zeta_\varphi)| \asymp H(W_k)^{-1-2\eta_k}. \tag{27}$$

Moreover

$$|\zeta_\varphi - \alpha_k| \asymp H(\alpha_k)^{-1} H(\alpha_{k+1})^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta_k}},$$

and

$$|W_k(\zeta_\varphi)| \asymp H(W_{k+1})^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta_k}}. \tag{28}$$

Since η_k corresponds to $1/\sigma$ by (9), Lemma 3.3 readily yields the lower bounds for the exponents in Theorem 1.1. For the upper bounds Liouville inequality was applied to exclude better quadratic approximations, see the proofs of [5, Corollary 6.1 and Corollary 6.2]. It was shown that there are no algebraic α of degree at most two and height less than $H(\alpha_{k+1})$ closer to ζ than α_k. Similarly $|P(\zeta_\varphi)|$ is minimized among all linear or quadratic $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of height less than $H(W_{k+1})$ for $P = W_k$. We will apply this in the proof of Theorem 2.2. In fact the proof of Theorem 2.1 will confirm it, though. We show that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied for ζ_φ with the polynomials given by

$$P_i = W_i, \qquad Q_i = W_{i+1},$$

with W_i as above. Observe that these specializations lead to

$$\mu_i = 1 + 2\eta_i + o(1), \qquad \nu_i = \frac{2 + \frac{1}{\eta_i}}{1 + 2\eta_i} + o(1) = \frac{1}{\eta_i} + o(1) \tag{29}$$

by (27) and (28). It follows from $\eta_k > 1$ that (21) is satisfied and (22) can be readily checked for $n = 2$ with (29) as well. The remaining conditions are obviously satisfied. Thus Theorem 3.1 implies the following.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ be as above. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and large $i \geq i_0(\epsilon)$ with $X_i = H(W_i)$ the inequality* (23) *for $n = 2$ has no solution $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most* 3*. In particular* (11) *holds.*

Keep the more general parametric claim of Corollary 3.4 in mind for the proof (10) in Section 5. In fact we will need the following fact evolving from proof of Theorem 3.1 in combination with the above observations: for $\epsilon > 0$ and large $i \geq i_0(\epsilon)$ the polynomials $\{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\} = \{W_i, W_{i+1}, TW_i, TW_{i+1}\}$ span a space of dimension four and with $X := H(W_{i+1})$ satisfy

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq 4} H(B_j) \ll X, \qquad \max_{1 \leq j \leq 4} |B_j(\zeta)| \leq X^{-3+\epsilon}.$$

The proof of (10) requires some more preparation from Section 4 below.

3.2. **An identity for Sturmian continued fractions.** At this point we want to enclose some remarks on the proof in the last section. A special case of [6, Theorem 2.2] shows that for any real number ζ which satisfies the condition $w_n(\zeta) > w_{n-1}(\zeta)$, we have

$$\widehat{w}_n(\zeta) \le \frac{nw_n(\zeta)}{w_n(\zeta) - n + 1}. \tag{30}$$

We do not know whether the assumption $w_n(\zeta) > w_{n-1}(\zeta)$ is really necessary for the conclusion or not, the analogue of (30) for the exponents $w_n^*, \widehat{w}_n^*$ holds unconditionally [6, Theorem 2.4]. See also [23] for an unconditioned weaker estimate in the flavor of (30). Inserting the values of Theorem 1.1, we see that for $n = 2$ the Sturmian continued fractions ζ_φ provide equality in (30). Our proof of (11) relied on a parametric version of this identity, concretely (22), that arose from Lemma 3.3. Indeed, if we identify μ_i with $w_2(\zeta_\varphi)$ and ν_i with $\widehat{w}_2(\zeta_\varphi)/w_2(\zeta_\varphi)$, then (22) becomes the reverse inequality to (30) as $\epsilon \to 0$. We see that in fact the quotients $n/(\nu_i(\mu_i - n + 1))$ in (22) converge to 1 as $i \to \infty$ for ζ_φ.

We briefly discuss equality in (30) for $n > 2$. By (2), equality obviously occurs for any U_n-number in Mahler's classification of real numbers, that is a transcendental real number which satisfies $w_n(\zeta) = \infty$ and n is the smallest such index. The existence of U_n-numbers of any prescribed degree $n \ge 1$ was constructively proved by LeVeque [13]. Most likely equality will hold for all (or at least some) U_m-numbers with $m < n$ as well. For $m = 1$ this is true as a consequence of [18, Theorem 1.12]. However, for $n \ge 3$ and $w_n(\zeta) < \infty$ (or $\widehat{w}_n(\zeta) > n$), it is completely open whether equality in (30) can occur. In fact it is not even known if there exist transcendental real ζ with $\widehat{w}_n(\zeta) > n$ for some $n \ge 3$. A necessary condition for equality in (30) is $w_n(\zeta) \ge h_n$, where $h_n > 2n - 1$ is given by

$$h_n := \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1 + 2n\sqrt{n^2 - 2n + \frac{5}{4}}}{n-1} + 2n - 1\right),$$

and even a slightly larger bound can be given when $n = 3$. This follows from the proof of [6, Theorem 2.1] based on the fact that otherwise smaller upper bounds for $\widehat{w}_n(\zeta)$ are obtained by Schmidt and Summerer [25]. Assuming a conjecture of Schmidt and Summerer [26] the bound h_n can be replaced by a larger one in case of $n \ge 4$ as well. See [21, Section 5.1], in particular [21, (33)], on how to derive concrete numerical bounds smaller than h_n.

4. Parametric geometry of numbers

We recall the concepts of the parametric geometry of numbers for the proof of (10). We follow Schmidt and Summerer [24], [25], very similarly as in [17]. Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ be given and $Q > 1$ a parameter. For $n \ge 1$ and $1 \le j \le n + 1$ define $\psi_{n,j}(Q)$ as the maximum of $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|x| \le Q^{1+\eta}, \qquad \max_{1 \le j \le n} |\zeta^j x - y_j| \le Q^{-\frac{1}{n}+\eta}$$

has (at least) j linearly independent solutions $(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$. The functions $\psi_{n,j}(Q)$ can be equivalently defined as a lattice point problem, see [24]. The possible range of every $\psi_{n,j}$ for $Q \in (1, \infty)$ is given by

$$-1 \le \psi_{n,j}(Q) \le \frac{1}{n}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n.$$

Define the derived quantities

$$\underline{\psi}_{n,j} = \liminf_{Q\to\infty} \psi_{n,j}(Q), \qquad \overline{\psi}_{n,j} = \limsup_{Q\to\infty} \psi_{n,j}(Q).$$

These values clearly all lie in the interval $[-1, 1/n]$. From Dirichlet's Theorem it follows that $\psi_{n,1}(Q) < 0$ for all $Q > 1$ and hence $\overline{\psi}_{n,1} \le 0$. Now we define the dual functions $\psi^*_{n,j}(Q)$ from [24]. For $1 \le j \le n+1$ and a parameter $Q > 1$, define the value $\psi^*_{n,j}(Q)$ as the maximum of $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|H(P)| \le Q^{\frac{1}{n}+\eta}, \qquad |P(\zeta)| \le Q^{-1+\eta}$$

has (at least) j linearly independent solutions in polynomials $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n. See [24] for the connection of the functions $\psi^*_{n,j}$ to a related lattice point problem, similarly as for the simultaneous approximation problem above. Again we consider

$$\underline{\psi}^*_{n,j} = \liminf_{Q\to\infty} \psi^*_{n,j}(Q), \qquad \overline{\psi}^*_{n,j} = \limsup_{Q\to\infty} \psi^*_{n,j}(Q).$$

For transcendental real ζ Schmidt and Summerer [25, (1.11)] established the inequalities

$$j\underline{\psi}_{n,j} + (n+1-j)\overline{\psi}_{n,n+1} \ge 0, \qquad j\underline{\psi}_{n,j} + (n+1-j)\overline{\psi}_{n,n+1} \le 0,$$

for $1 \le j \le n+1$. The dual inequalities

$$j\underline{\psi}^*_{n,j} + (n+1-j)\overline{\psi}^*_{n,n+1} \ge 0, \qquad j\underline{\psi}^*_{n,j} + (n+1-j)\overline{\psi}^*_{n,n+1} \le 0, \tag{31}$$

hold as well for the same reason, as pointed out in [17]. Mahler's inequality implies

$$|\psi_{n,j}(Q) + \psi^*_{n,n+2-j}(Q)| \ll \frac{1}{\log Q}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+1. \tag{32}$$

In particular we have

$$\underline{\psi}_{n,j} = -\overline{\psi}^*_{n,n+2-j}, \qquad \overline{\psi}_{n,j} = -\underline{\psi}^*_{n,n+2-j}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+1. \tag{33}$$

Hence all values $\underline{\psi}^*_{n,j}, \overline{\psi}^*_{n,j}$ lie in the interval $[-\frac{1}{n}, 1]$. Moreover $\overline{\psi}^*_{n,1} \le 0$ follows again from Dirichlet's Theorem. For $q > 0$ we further define the functions

$$L_{n,j}(q) = q\psi_{n,j}(Q), \qquad L^*_{n,j}(q) = q\psi^*_{n,j}(Q), \tag{34}$$

where $Q = e^q$. These functions are piecewise linear with slopes among $\{-1, 1/n\}$ and $\{-1/n, 1\}$ respectively. More precisely locally any $L_{n,j}$ coincides with some

$$L_{\underline{x}}(q) = \max\left\{\log|x| - q, \max_{1\le j\le n} \log|\zeta^j x - y_j| + \frac{q}{n}\right\} \tag{35}$$

where $\underline{x} = (x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ for y_j the closest integer to $\zeta^j x$, see [24, page 75]. Similarly any $L^*_{n,j}$ coincides locally with

$$L^*_P(q) = \max\left\{\log H(P) - \frac{q}{n}, \log|P(\zeta)| + q\right\} \tag{36}$$

for some $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n. As noticed in [17], when $(Q, \psi^*_{n,j}(Q))$ is a local minimum of some function $\psi^*_{n,j}$ then then there exist j linearly independent polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_j \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n such that

$$(1 + w_n^{(j)})\left(\frac{1}{n} + \psi^*_{n,j}(Q)\right) = \frac{n+1}{n} \tag{37}$$

holds for $w_n^{(j)} := \min_{1\le i\le j} -\log|P_i(\zeta)|/\log H(P_i)$, and vice versa. Very similarly a dual parametric version of (39) for the functions $\psi_{n,j}(Q)$ can be obtained. Minkowski's second lattice point Theorem translates into

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} L_{n,j}(q)\right| \ll 1, \qquad \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} L^*_{n,j}(q)\right| \ll 1. \tag{38}$$

Hence in any interval $I = (q_1, q_2)$ the sum of the differences $L_{n,j}(q_2) - L_{n,j}(q_1)$ (and $L^*_{n,j}(q_2) - L^*_{n,j}(q_1)$) over $1 \le j \le n+1$ are bounded in absolute value.

We relate $\psi_{n,j}(Q), \psi^*_{n,j}(Q)$ and the quantities derived from it to another kind of successive minima approximation exponents, which generalize the classic exponents $w_n, \widehat{w}_n, \lambda_n, \widehat{\lambda}_n$ from Section 1. Fix $n \ge 1$ and let $1 \le j \le n+1$. Let $w_{n,j}(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{w}_{n,j}(\zeta)$ be the supremum of $w \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (1) has (at least) j linearly independent polynomial solutions $P(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most n for arbitrarily large X, and all large X, respectively. Similarly, define $\lambda_{n,j}(\zeta)$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_{n,j}(\zeta)$ as the supremum of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (3) has (at least) j linearly independent solutions $(x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ for arbitrarily large X, and all large X, respectively. For $j = 1$ just the classic exponents are obtained. The indicated relation is given by

$$(1 + \lambda_{n,j})(1 + \underline{\psi}_{n,j}) = (1 + \widehat{\lambda}_{n,j})(1 + \overline{\psi}_{n,j}) = \frac{n+1}{n}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+1, \tag{39}$$

and

$$(1 + w_{n,j})\Big(\frac{1}{n} + \underline{\psi}^*_{n,j}\Big) = (1 + \widehat{w}_{n,j})\Big(\frac{1}{n} + \overline{\psi}^*_{n,j}\Big) = \frac{n+1}{n}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+1. \tag{40}$$

As pointed out in [19] and used in [17] repeated application of (33), (39) and (40) yields

$$\lambda_{n,j}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{\widehat{w}_{n,n+2-j}(\zeta)}, \qquad \widehat{\lambda}_{n,j}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{w_{n+2-j}(\zeta)}, \tag{41}$$

for $1 \le j \le n+1$.

We recall [17, Lemma 3.3] in a slightly modified form. In fact, since ζ_φ are bad approximable with respect to one-dimensional approximation, the error term in our formulation can be made even slightly smaller. (It is not known whether all extremal numbers involved in [17, Lemma 3.3] are bad approximable, only the weaker claim that $|\zeta - y/x| \gg x^{-2}\max\{2, \log x\}^{-c}$ for some $c = c(\zeta) \ge 0$ and all rational numbers y/x was shown by Roy [14, Theorem 1.3]). For fixed real ζ we will say a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$

of degree at most 3 *induces a point* $(q, L_P^*(q))$ *in the* 3*-dimensional Schmidt-Summerer diagram* if $(q, L_P^*(q))$ is the local minimum of L_P^* implicitly defined by

$$L_P^*(q) = \log H(P) - \frac{q}{3} = \log |P(\zeta)| + q, \tag{42}$$

consistent with (36).

Lemma 4.1. *Let* ζ *be a real transcendental number. Let* $P, Q, R \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ *be of large heights and such that* $R = PQ$ *and* R *has degree at most three. Assume* P *induces the point* $(q_1, L_P^*(q_1))$ *and* R *induces the point* $(q_2, L_R^*(q_2))$ *in the* 3*-dimensional Schmidt-Summerer diagram. Further assume*

$$|Q(\zeta)| \asymp H(Q)^{-1}. \tag{43}$$

Then

$$\frac{L_R^*(q_2) - L_P^*(q_1)}{q_2 - q_1} = \frac{1}{3} + o(1), \qquad H(Q) \to \infty. \tag{44}$$

We omit the proof since it is very similar to the one of [17, Lemma 3.3].

5. Proofs of Theorems 3.1, 2.1 and 2.2

For convenience we prepone an easy proposition which in fact is an immediate consequence of Minkowski's second lattice point theorem.

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $k \geq 1$ *be an integer and* ζ *be a real number. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

- $w_k(\zeta) = k$
- $\widehat{w}_{k,k+1}(\zeta) = k$
- $\widehat{w}_{k,k+1}(\zeta) \geq k$
- $w_{k,j}(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_{k,j}(\zeta) = k$ *for all* $1 \leq j \leq k+1$.
- $\lambda_{k,j}(\zeta) = \widehat{\lambda}_{k,j}(\zeta) = 1/k$ *for all* $1 \leq j \leq k+1$.

Proof. Clearly the fourth claim implies the first three. It follows from (5) that $w_k(\zeta) = k$ is equivalent to $\lambda_k(\zeta) = 1/k$, but $\lambda_k(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_{k,k+1}(\zeta)^{-1}$ by (41). Hence the first and the second claim are equivalent. The second is equivalent to the third since by (41) and (4) again the reverse inequality $\widehat{w}_{k,k+1}(\zeta) = \lambda_k(\zeta)^{-1} \leq k$ holds for any ζ. The first three claims which are equivalent imply the foruth since $w_k(\zeta) \geq w_{k,j}(\zeta) \geq \widehat{w}_{k,j}(\zeta) \geq \widehat{w}_{k,k+1}(\zeta)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq k+1$ is obvious. Finally the last two claims are equivalent by (41) again. □

Now we can prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. In view of Proposition 5.1 with $k = 2n-1$, it suffices to show (23). Further by Proposition 5.1 it suffices to find for certain arbitrarily large real X_i a set of $2n$ linearly independent polynomials $G_{1,i}, \ldots, G_{2n,i} \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ that satisfy

$$H(G_{j,i}) \leq X_i, \qquad |G_{j,i}(\zeta)| \leq X_i^{-2n+1+\epsilon}, \qquad 1 \leq j \leq 2n,\ i \geq 1. \tag{45}$$

Since by assumption $w_{n-1}(\zeta) = n-1 < n \le w_n(\zeta)$, for large i the polynomials P_i and Q_i must have degree precisely n and be irreducible. This follows from (47) and the definition of w_n and was essentially carried out in [27] and already used frequently in [6]. Let $X_i := H(Q_i)$. By assumption

$$H(P_i) = X_i^{\nu_i}, \qquad |P_i(\zeta)| \le X_i^{-\nu_i\mu_i+\epsilon}.$$

By Proposition 5.1 with $k = n-1$ our assumption $w_{n-1}(\zeta) = n-1$ yields $\widehat{w}_{n-1,n}(\zeta) = n-1$. In other words for any large parameter $Y \ge Y_0(\epsilon)$ there exist linearly independent polynomials $R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most $n-1$ that satisfy

$$H(R_j) \le Y, \qquad |R_j(\zeta)| \le Y^{-n+1+\epsilon}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n.$$

For Y choose the sequence of parameters

$$Y_i = \frac{X_i}{H(P_i)} = X_i^{1-\nu_i}.$$

For $1 \le j \le n$ and $i \ge 1$ denote by $R_{j,i}$ the polynomials R_j above for the parameter Y_i. We show that the polynomials $P_{j,i} := P_i R_{j,i}$ provide n of the $2n$ polynomials in (45) with respect to the parameter X_i. Clearly each $P_{j,i}$ has degree at most $n + (n-1) = 2n-1$. Moreover by construction and (47) we have

$$H(P_{j,i}) \ll_n H(P_i) \cdot H(R_{j,i}) \le X, \qquad 1 \le j \le n,\ i \ge 1.$$

The evaluations of the $P_{j,i}$ at ζ can be estimated via

$$|P_{j,i}(\zeta)| = |P_i(\zeta)| \cdot |R_{j,i}(\zeta)| \le X^{-\nu_i\mu_i+\epsilon} \cdot X^{(1-\nu_i)(-n+1+\epsilon)}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n,\ i \ge 1. \tag{46}$$

By assumption (22) of the theorem, and since $w_n(\zeta) \ge n > n-1$ implies that the right hand side of (46) decay as ν_i increases, we infer

$$|P_{j,i}(\zeta)| \le X^{-2n+1+\epsilon_0}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n,\ i \ge 1$$

for some variation ϵ_0 of ϵ which tends to 0 as ϵ does. As the remaining n polynomials we take $Q_{j,i}(T) = T^{j-1}Q_i(T)$ for $1 \le j \le n$ and $i \ge 1$. Obviously $Q_{j,i}$ have degree at most $2n-1$, height $H(Q_{j,i}) = H(Q_i) = X_i$ and satisfy $|Q_{j,i}(\zeta)| \ll_{\zeta,n} |Q_i(\zeta)|$ for $1 \le j \le n$. Hence

$$|Q_{j,i}(\zeta)| \ll_{n,\zeta} X_i^{-2n+1+\epsilon}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n,\ i \ge 1.$$

Let $\epsilon_1 = \max\{\epsilon, \epsilon_0\}$. Summing up, for certain arbitrarily large X we have found $2n$ polynomials $\mathcal{G} := \{G_{1,i}, \dots, G_{2n,i}\} := \{P_{1,i}, \dots, P_{n,i}, Q_{1,i}, \dots, Q_{n,i}\}$ that satisfy

$$H(G_{j,i}) \ll_{n,\zeta} X_i, \qquad |G_{j,i}(\zeta)| \le X_i^{-2n+1+\epsilon_1} \qquad 1 \le j \le 2n,\ i \ge 1.$$

For the proof of (45) it remains to be checked that $\mathcal{G}$ is a linearly independent set. The linear independence of $\mathcal{P} := \{P_{1,i}, \dots, P_{n,i}\}$ follows obviously from the linear independence of $\{R_{1,i}, \dots, R_{n,i}\}$. The linear independence of the $\mathcal{Q} := \{Q_{1,i}, \dots, Q_{n,i}\}$ is obvious. Any linear combination of the $P_{j,i}$ is of the form P_iU for some polynomial $U \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ and any linear combination of the Q_j is of the form Q_iV for some $V \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ where U, V have degree at most $n-1$. Since on the other hand P_i, Q_i are distinct, irreducible and of degree n, by the unique factorization in $\mathbb{Z}[T]$ we infer that the equation $P_iU + Q_iV = 0$ can only be satisfied if both U and V vanish identically. By the linear independence of $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ this results in the linear independence of $\mathcal{G}$. The proof is finished. □

Now we turn to the proof of the following next partial assertion of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ with corresponding $\sigma = \sigma_\varphi$ be as above. Then*

$$w_3(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}, \qquad \lambda_3(\zeta) = \frac{1}{1+2\sigma}.$$

We enclose some preliminaries for the proof of Theorem 5.2. Note first that for any polynomials Q_1, Q_2 with integral coefficients of degree bounded by n, we have

$$H(Q_1Q_2) \asymp_n H(Q_1)H(Q_2). \tag{47}$$

This is often referred to as Gelfond's lemma, see also [27, Hilfssatz 3]. As in our applications the dimensions n are fixed we can assume absolute constants in (47). We will sometimes implicitly use the consequence that if $Q = Q_1Q_2$ then $|Q(\zeta)| \le H(Q)^{-z}$ implies that either $|Q_1(\zeta)| \ll H(Q_1)^{-z}$ or $|Q_2(\zeta)| \ll H(Q_2)^{-z}$ must be satisfied, which was essentially used by Wirsing [27].

As in [17] we give a brief outline of some facts we will show in the course of the proof. We will establish a rather precise description of the functions $L^*_{3,1}(q), \dots, L^*_{3,4}(q)$ on $q \in (0,\infty)$ induced by $(\zeta_\varphi, \zeta_\varphi^2, \zeta_\varphi^3)$. Denote by $|I|$ the length of an interval I. We will show that any ζ_φ induces a partition of the positive real numbers in successive closed intervals $I_1, J_1, I_2, J_2, \dots$ (up to single numbers belonging to two successive intervals) with the following properties.

- $\lim_{k\to\infty} |I_k|/|J_k| = 1$.
- At the left interval end of every I_k, all $L^*_{3,i}(q)$ are all small (more precisely $o(q)$ as $q \to \infty$) by absolute value. In I_k the functions $L^*_{3,1}(q), L^*_{3,2}(q)$ essentially decay with slope $-1/3$, whereas $L^*_{3,3}(q), L^*_{3,4}(q)$ essentially rise with slope $1/3$.
- At the right interval end of I_k, which equals the left interval end of J_k, the opposite behavior appears. The functions $L^*_{3,1}(q), L^*_{3,2}(q)$ essentially rise with slope $1/3$ in J_k, whereas $L^*_{3,3}(q), L^*_{3,4}(q)$ essentially decay with slope $-1/3$. Ultimately the functions $L^*_{3,1}, \dots, L^*_{3,4}$ asymptotically meet at the right end of J_k, which equals the left interval end of the successive I_{k+1}.
- The functions $|L^*_{3,1}(q) - L^*_{3,2}(q)|$, $|L^*_{3,3}(q) - L^*_{3,4}(q)|$ are bounded uniformly in q.

The word "essentially" in the above description means that the stated behavior might be violated in short intervals only. As for the special case of extremal numbers $\zeta_{\gamma-1}$ in [17], the description applies to the simultaneous approximation functions $L_{3,j}(q)$ as well by (33), and again we have

$$w_{3,1}(\zeta) = w_{3,2}(\zeta), \quad w_{3,3}(\zeta) = w_{3,4}(\zeta), \quad \widehat{w}_{3,1}(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_{3,2}(\zeta), \quad \widehat{w}_{3,3}(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_{3,4}(\zeta), \tag{48}$$

$$\lambda_{3,1}(\zeta) = \lambda_{3,2}(\zeta), \quad \lambda_{3,3}(\zeta) = \lambda_{3,4}(\zeta), \quad \widehat{\lambda}_{3,1}(\zeta) = \widehat{\lambda}_{3,2}(\zeta), \quad \widehat{\lambda}_{3,3}(\zeta) = \widehat{\lambda}_{3,4}(\zeta), \tag{49}$$

which refines the claim of Theorem 2.1. Similarly as in the special case, the decay phases of $L^*_{3,\cdot}$ will turn out to be induced by the polynomials W_k from Lemma 3.3. The rising phases are induced by products W_kE_l for fixed W_k and suitable successive best approximation polynomials E_l in dimension 1, defined by the property

$$E_l(\zeta_\varphi) = \min\{|Q(\zeta_\varphi)| : Q \in \mathbb{Z}[T],\ \deg(Q) = 1,\ 1 \le H(Q) \le H(E_l)\}. \tag{50}$$

By Dirichlet's Theorem and since on the other hand any ζ_φ is bad approximable we have

$$|E_l(\zeta_\varphi)| \asymp H(E_l)^{-1}. \tag{51}$$

In view of Lemma 4.1 this fact will lead to an asymptotic increase by $1/3$ for graph L_3^* induced by the succession of certain products $W_kE_l, W_kE_{l+1}, \dots, W_kE_{l+h}$. In contrast to the special case of extremal numbers $\zeta_{\gamma-1}$, where the quotients of $|I_{k+1}|/|I_k|$ and $|J_{k+1}|/|J_k|$ tend to the golden ratio γ, in general they depend on the sequence $(s_k)_{k\geq 1}$ connected to ζ_φ. Our proof of Theorem 5.2 below essentially employs the same method as for the determination of $\lambda_3(\zeta), w_3(\zeta)$ for extremal numbers ζ in the proof of [17, (11) in Theorem 2.1]. In fact many parts of the proof will be almost identical. Recall the definitions of η_k and W_k from Section 3 associated to ζ_φ, the latter essentially replace the polynomials P_k from [17].

Proof of Theorem 5.2. The proof of Corollary 3.4 via Theorem 3.1 (see also Proposition 5.1) shows that for any large k, with $X = H(W_{k+1})$ we have four linearly independent polynomials

$$\{B_1, \dots, B_4\} = \{W_{k+1}, TW_{k+1}, W_k, TW_k\}$$

with $H(B_i) \ll X$ and $|B_i(\zeta)| \leq X^{-3+\epsilon}$. With (40) this means that for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, any large k induces $q_k > 0$ such that all

$$|L_{3,i}^*(q_k)| \leq \varepsilon q_k, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq 4, \tag{52}$$

where $\lim_{k\to\infty} q_k/\log H(W_{k+1}) = 3$ in view of (36). By Lemma 3.3 any polynomial W_k satisfies

$$-\frac{\log|W_k(\zeta)|}{\log H(W_k)} = 1 + 2\eta_k + o(1) \geq 2 + \sqrt{5} + o(1) > 3, \qquad k \to \infty,$$

and so do $B_1 = W_{k+1}(T)$ and $B_2 = TW_{k+1}(T)$. Hence $L_{3,1}^*$ and $L_{3,2}^*$ decay with asymptotic slope $-1/3$ in some interval (q_k, b_k) and (q_k, c_k) respectively, for b_k and c_k local minima of $L_{3,1}^*$ and $L_{3,2}^*$ respectively. More precisely, the local minima $(d_k, L_{W_{k+1}}^*(d_k))$ and $(e_k, L_{TW_{k+1}}^*(e_k))$ of the functions $L_{W_{k+1}}^*$ and $L_{TW_{k+1}}^*$ as in (36), respectively almost coincide with local minima $(b_k, L_{3,1}^*(b_k))$ and $(c_k, L_{3,2}^*(c_k))$. More precisely we mean that all differences

$$\max\{|b_k - d_k|, |b_k - e_k|, |c_k - d_k|, |c_k - e_k|\} \ll 1$$

such as the corresponding differences of the L^* evaluations

$$|L_{3,1}^*(b_k) - L_{W_{k+1}}^*(d_k)| \ll 1, \qquad |L_{3,1}^*(b_k) - L_{W_{k+1}}^*(e_k)| \ll 1,$$
$$|L_{3,2}^*(c_k) - L_{TW_{k+1}}^*(d_k)| \ll 1, \qquad |L_{3,2}^*(c_k) - L_{TW_{k+1}}^*(e_k)| \ll 1,$$

are uniformly bounded in k. Moreover, since $W_{k+1}(\zeta)$ and $\zeta W_{k+1}(\zeta)$ differ only by the factor ζ, we have $b_k/c_k = 1 + o(1)$ as $k \to \infty$ (in fact $b_k - c_k = O(1)$). Hence with the parametric formula (37) for the parameter choice $w_3^{(1)} = w_3^{(2)} = 1 + 2\eta_k + o(1)$, with

$$Q_k := e^{b_k}, \qquad k \geq 1,$$

we calculate

$$\psi_{3,j}^*(Q_k) = \frac{1-\eta_k}{3(1+\eta_k)} + o(1), \qquad j \in \{1,2\},\ k \to \infty. \tag{53}$$

Since $L^*_{3,1}$ and $L^*_{3,2}$ both decay with asymptotic slope $-1/3$ in intervals $I_k := (q_k, b_k)$, it follows from (38) that the sum $L^*_{3,3} + L^*_{3,4}$ asymptotically increases with constant slope $2/3$ in I_k, that is for any $q_k \le a < b \le b_k$ we have

$$L^*_{3,3}(b) + L^*_{3,4}(b) - L^*_{3,3}(a) - L^*_{3,4}(a) = (b-a)(\frac{2}{3} + o(1)), \qquad k \to \infty.$$

Assume we have aready shown that both $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ increase at most by $1/3$ in any large subinterval of I_k, that is for any $q_k \le a < b \le b_k$ we have

$$L^*_{3,3}(b) - L^*_{3,3}(a) \le (b-a)(\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon), \qquad L^*_{3,4}(b) - L^*_{3,4}(a) \le (b-a)(\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon). \tag{54}$$

Then both must have asymptotically increase precisely $1/3$ in the entire interval I_k, that is $L^*_{3,j}(b) - L^*_{3,j}(a) = (b-a)(1/3 + o(1))$ for $j \in \{3,4\}$ as $k \to \infty$. We more precisely establish the following two claims. *Claim A:* For any parameter $\tilde{X} \in (H(W_k), \infty)$, let

$$U_{k,\tilde{X}} = W_k \cdot E_t, \qquad V_{k,\tilde{X}} = W_k \cdot E_{t+1}$$

with $t = t(k, \tilde{X})$ chosen as the largest integer for which $\max\{H(U_{k,\tilde{X}}), H(V_{k,\tilde{X}})\} \le \tilde{X}$. Look at the functions $L^*_{3,\cdot}(q)$ that arise from the succession of the $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}, L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ as $\tilde{X}$ runs through $(H(W_k), \infty)$, induced locally by the formula (36). They have asymptotically constant slope $1/3$ in (b_{k-1}, ∞). More precisely, for any $b_{k-1} \le \tilde{X} < \tilde{Y}$ if $(a, L_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}(a))$ or $(a, L_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}(a))$ lies in the graph of $L_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ or $L_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ respectively and similarly for $(b, L_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}(b))$ or $(b, L_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}(b))$, then we have

$$L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{Y}}}(b) - L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}(a) = (b-a)(\frac{1}{3} + o(1)), \qquad L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{Y}}}(b) - L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}(a) = (b-a)(\frac{1}{3} + o(1)).$$

Claim B: Moreover if we restrict to $\tilde{X} \in (H(W_{k+1}), H(W_{k+2}))$, then $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ and $L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ induce $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ on I_k respectively (remark: as we will see later on they induce $L^*_{3,1}$ and $L^*_{3,2}$ in intervals (b_{k-1}, q_k) if we let $\tilde{X} \in (H(W_k), H(W_{k+1}))$).

First recall that at the left end point q_k of the interval I_k, the successive minima are induced basically by $\{W_k, TW_k, W_{k+1}, TW_{k+1}\}$. Claim A follows essentially from Lemma 4.1, if we identify E_t and E_{t+1} respectively with Q and W_k with P. Note also that δ from Lemma 4.1 tends to 0 in our context in view of (51), which also implies that consecutive functions of the form $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ or $L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ do not differ much. Finally the condition $1/\log H(Q) = O(\delta)$ does not cause problems since for any fixed $\delta > 0$ and smaller heights $H(Q)$ only minor changes of the function $L^*_{3,\cdot}(q)$ can appear in intervals $(b_{k-1}, b_{k-1}+O(1))$, such that the global behavior of the function remains unaffected. We turn to Claim B. Notice that $\{U_{k,\tilde{X}}, V_{k,\tilde{X}}\}$ span the same space as $\{W_k, TW_k\}$ for all $\tilde{X} \in (H(W_k), \infty)$, and we have already noticed that polynomials in the space $\{W_{k+1}, TW_{k+1}\}$ induce the first two successive minima in I_k and $\{W_k, TW_k, W_{k+1}, TW_{k+1}\}$ are linearly independent. Thus $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ are bounded by $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ and $L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ in I_k respectively, and thus have slope at most by $1/3$. As noticed above we may conclude $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ must actually coincide with the functions induced by $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ and $L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ respectively.

In combination with (53) we derive

$$\psi^*_{3,j}(Q_k) = \frac{1-\eta_k}{3(1+\eta_k)} + o(1), \qquad j \in \{1,2\},\ k \to \infty,$$
$$\psi^*_{3,j}(Q_k) = -\frac{1-\eta_k}{3(1+\eta_k)} + o(1), \qquad j \in \{3,4\},\ k \to \infty.$$

In particular since $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \eta_k = \sigma^{-1}$ by (9) we have

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \psi^*_{3,1}(Q_k) = \liminf_{k\to\infty} \psi^*_{3,2}(Q_k) = \frac{\sigma-1}{3(\sigma+1)} \tag{55}$$

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} \psi^*_{3,4}(Q_k) = -\frac{\sigma-1}{3(\sigma+1)}. \tag{56}$$

Let $J_k := (b_k, q_{k+1})$. We show that in J_k, the functions $L^*_{3,1}, L^*_{3,2}$ have slope $-1/3$, whereas the functions $L^*_{3,3}, L^*_{3,4}$ have (asymptotic) slope $1/3$, until they all meet (asymptotically) at q_{k+1}. Indeed

$$L^*_{3,1}(q_{k+1}) - L^*_{3,1}(b_k) = (q_{k+1}-b_k)(-\frac{1}{3}+o(1)), \quad L^*_{3,2}(q_{k+1}) - L^*_{3,2}(b_k) = (q_{k+1}-b_k)(-\frac{1}{3}+o(1))$$

such as

$$L^*_{3,3}(q_{k+1}) - L^*_{3,3}(b_k) = (q_{k+1}-b_k)(\frac{1}{3}+o(1)), \quad L^*_{3,4}(q_{k+1}) - L^*_{3,4}(b_k) = (q_{k+1}-b_k)(\frac{1}{3}+o(1))$$

and

$$L^*_{3,4}(q_{k+1}) - L^*_{3,1}(q_{k+1}) = q_{k+1} \cdot o(1)$$

hold as $k \to \infty$. By (52) upon the index shift k to $k+1$, we deduce that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and large $k \geq k_0(\varepsilon)$ we have

$$|L^*_{3,i}(q_{k+1})| \leq \varepsilon q_{k+1}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq 4. \tag{57}$$

As we have established that $L^*_{3,1}$ and $L^*_{3,2}$ both decay in I_k with asymptotic slope $-1/3$ and (55) holds, it suffices to show that $\lim_{k\to\infty} |I_k|/|J_k| = 1$ to conclude that $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ must decay with the minimum possible slope $-1/3$ in the entire interval J_k and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} -\frac{L^*_{3,1}(b_k)}{q_{k+1}-b_k} = \lim_{k\to\infty} -\frac{L^*_{3,2}(b_k)}{q_{k+1}-b_k} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{L^*_{3,3}(b_k)}{q_{k+1}-b_k} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{L^*_{3,4}(b_k)}{q_{k+1}-b_k} = \frac{1}{3}. \tag{58}$$

We now show $|I_k|/|J_k| = 1 + o(1)$ as $k \to \infty$. By construction this is equivalent to $b_k = (q_k+q_{k+1})/2+o(q_k)$. Recall combination of (27) and (28) yields $\log H(W_{k+1})/\log H(W_k) = \eta_k + o(1)$, and moreover $L^*_{3,\cdot}(q_k) = o(q_k)$ and $L^*_{3,\cdot}(q_{k+1}) = o(q_{k+1})$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover $L^*_{3,1}, L^*_{3,2}$ decay in (q_k, b_k) induced by W_{k+1}, TW_{k+1} and thus by (36) we have $L^*_{3,\cdot}(q_i) = \log H(W_{i+1}) - q_i/3$, for $1 \leq j \leq 4$ and any $i \geq 1$. Together this yields

$$\frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k} = \eta_k + o(1), \qquad k \to \infty. \tag{59}$$

Thus the claimed asymptotic relation $b_k = (q_k + q_{k+1})/2 + o(q_k)$ is equivalent to $b_k = q_k \cdot (1+\eta_k)/2 + o(q_k)$. We know that at $Q_k = e^{b_k}$ we have asymptotically

$$\psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k) = \frac{b_k - q_k}{3} + o(q_k), \qquad k \to \infty, \tag{60}$$

since $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,3}$ are small at q_k by (52) and rise with slope $1/3$ in I_k. We remark that the asymptotic (60) holds for $\psi^*_{3,4}(Q_k)$ as well. On the other hand (55) provides an asymptotic formula for $\psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k)$ and $\psi^*_{3,4}(Q_k)$. It follows directly from the definition of $L^*_{3,j}$ via $\psi^*_{3,j}$ in (34) that $\psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k)$ is the slope from the origin to $(b_k, L^*_{3,3}(b_k))$ of $L^*_{3,3}$ in the Schmidt-Summerer diagram (and similarly for $L^*_{3,4}$). Hence asymptotically

$$\psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k) = -\frac{1-\eta_k}{3(1+\eta_k)} b_k + o(b_k), \qquad k \to \infty. \tag{61}$$

The asymptotic formula (61) holds for $\psi^*_{3,4}(Q_k)$ as well. Comparing the two expressions for $\psi^*_{3,3}(Q_k)$ in (60) and (61), with a short computation indeed we verify $b_k = q_k \cdot (1 + \eta_k)/2 + o(q_k)$, so we have proved our hypothesis $|I_k|/|J_k| = 1 + o(1)$ as $k \to \infty$.

Consequently $L^*_{3,3}$ and $L^*_{3,4}$ both asymptotically decay with slope $-1/3$ in J_k. From (38) we further deduce that the sum $L^*_{3,1} + L^*_{3,2}$ must asymptotically increase by $2/3$ in J_k. By this again we mean that for $b_k \le a < b \le q_{k+1}$ we have

$$L^*_{3,1}(b) + L^*_{3,2}(b) - L^*_{3,1}(a) - L^*_{3,2}(a) = \left(\frac{2}{3} + o(1)\right) \cdot (b-a), \qquad k \to \infty.$$

Now recall that Claim A implied that $L^*_{U_{k,\tilde{X}}}, L^*_{V_{k,\tilde{X}}}$ asymptotically induce an increase with slope at most $1/3$ in the entire interval $(b_{k-1}, \infty) = J_{k-1}$, if $\tilde{X}$ runs through $(H(W_k), \infty)$. Hence, if we restrict to $\tilde{X} \in (H(W_k), H(W_{k+1}))$, by a very similar argument as in Claim B, in the interval (b_{k-1}, q_k) they induce $L^*_{3,1}$ and $L^*_{3,2}$. It follows that $L^*_{3,1}$ and $L^*_{3,2}$ asymptotically increase with slope $1/3$ in J_{k-1}. By index shift the analogue claim is clearly also true for J_k.

Observe that the right interval end of J_k is the left interval end of I_{k+1}, such that we obtain a complete (asymptotic) description of all functions $L^*_{3,1}, \dots, L^*_{3,4}$ on $(0, \infty)$. Our characterizations of the graphs of $L^*_{3,i}(q)$ show that asymptotically at the values $q = b_k$ both the smallest local minima of $L^*_{3,1}(q), L^*_{3,2}(q)$ (in sense of minimal values of $\psi^*_{3,1}(Q), \psi^*_{3,2}(Q)$) and the largest local maxima of $L^*_{3,3}(q), L^*_{3,4}(q)$ (in sense of maximal values of $\psi^*_{3,3}(Q), \psi^*_{3,4}(Q)$) are attained. Furthermore, both $|L^*_{3,1}(b_k) - L^*_{3,2}(b_k)|$ and $|L^*_{3,3}(b_k) - L^*_{3,4}(b_k)|$ are bounded uniformly in k. More generally $|L^*_{3,1}(q) - L^*_{3,2}(q)|$ and $|L^*_{3,3}(q) - L^*_{3,4}(q)|$ are uniformly bounded for $q \in (0, \infty)$. Thus with (55) we infer

$$\underline{\psi}^*_{3,1} = \underline{\psi}^*_{3,2} = \frac{\sigma - 1}{3(\sigma+1)}, \qquad \overline{\psi}^*_{3,3} = \overline{\psi}^*_{3,4} = -\frac{\sigma-1}{3(\sigma+1)}.$$

With (33), (39) and (40) we derive

$$w_3(\zeta) = w_{3,2}(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}, \qquad \lambda_3(\zeta) = \lambda_{3,2}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{1+2\sigma}, \tag{62}$$

containing the claims of the theorem. □

Remark 5.3. We can also determine the remaining constants $w_{3,i}, \lambda_{3,i}, \widehat{w}_{3,i}, \widehat{\lambda}_{3,i}$ very similarly as executed for extremal numbers. See [17, Remark 4.2 and (50),(51)].

We infer $w_3^*(\zeta) = 1+2/\sigma$ for $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$ from the monotonicity of the sequence $(w_n^*(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$, inequality (6), Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 5.2 via

$$1 + \frac{2}{\sigma} = w_2^*(\zeta) \leq w_3^*(\zeta) \leq w_3(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}.$$

Before we establish the last claim (12) of Theorem 2.1 we turn towards Theorem 2.2. As in the case of extremal numbers, the description of the combined graph of the functions $L_{3,j}^*(q)$ from Theorem 2.1 allows for deducing Theorem 2.2. The proof is again very similar to the one of [17, Theorem 2.2].

Proof of Theorem 2.2. It follows from the proof of Theorem 5.2 that at any stage the first two successive minima functions of the linear form problem related to $\psi_{3,1}^*, \psi_{3,2}^*$ are induced by polynomial multiples of some polynomial W_k. Moreover we have already noticed that for each k these multiples span the same space as $\{W_k, TW_k\}$. For every $k \geq 1$, since the degree of W_k is two, there is no irreducible polynomial of degree exactly three which lies in the space spanned by $\{W_k, TW_k\}$. Thus the optimal exponent in (13) cannot exceed $w_{3,3}(\zeta)$. On the other hand it follows from the proof of Theorem 5.2 that $w_{3,3}(\zeta) = 3$. Thus indeed (13) has only finitely many solutions in $Q \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ an irreducible polynomial of degree precisely three. From (13) we infer (14) by a standard argument, see [17].

Next we show (16) and (17). From essentially the vector space argument from the proof of (13) we obtain that $\widehat{w}_{3,3}(\zeta)$ is an upper bound for the exponent in (16) for certain arbitrary large X. On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 5.2 again shows $\widehat{w}_{3,3}(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_{3,4}(\zeta) = 2\sigma + 1$. We conclude (16), and further deduce (17) very similarly as (14) from (13).

For (15) recall that in the proof of Theorem 2.1 (or Corollary 3.4) we showed that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and large $k \geq k_0(\epsilon)$ there exists a linear polynomial E_l such that with $X := H(W_{k+1})$ and $Q_{k,1} := W_k E_l$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &H(Q_{k,1}) \asymp H(W_{k+1}) = X, \\ &|Q_{k,1}(\zeta)| \leq X^{-3+\epsilon}, \qquad |W_{k+1}(\zeta)| \leq X^{-3+\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Since $Q_{k,1}$ is not irreducible by construction and P_{k+1} has degree only 2, we consider the polynomials $S_{k,j}(T) := Q_{k,1}(T) + jT \cdot W_{k+1}(T)$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. We show that at least one of them has the desired properties. The polynomials $S_{k,j}(T)$ obviously have degree three and height $H(S_{k,j}) \ll X$. Moreover (63) yields

$$|S_{k,j}(\zeta)| = |Q_{k,1}(\zeta) + j\zeta W_{k+1}(\zeta)| \leq |Q_{k,1}(\zeta)| + j|\zeta| \cdot |W_{k+1}(\zeta)| \ll_\zeta X^{-3+\epsilon},\ j \in \{1, 2\}. \tag{64}$$

Next we check that $S_{k,j}$ are irreducible for large k and $1 \leq j \leq 2$. Consider j fixed and suppose $S_{k,j}$ is reducible. Then we may write $S_{k,j}(T) = M(T)N(T)$ for $M, N \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ one of them linear the other quadratic. Then $|S_{k,j}(\zeta)| = |M(\zeta)| \cdot |N(\zeta)|$ and it follows from (47) and (64) that at least one of the inequalities

$$|M(\zeta)| \leq H(M)^{-3+2\epsilon}, \qquad |N(\zeta)| \leq H(N)^{-3+2\epsilon}$$

must be satisfied, see also the remark subsequent to (47). Without loss of generality say M has the desired property. Now we apply the fact that among the linear or quadratic

polynomial P of height less than $H(W_{k+1})$ the value $|P(\zeta_\varphi)|$ is minimized for $P = W_k$ (in other words $(W_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is the sequence of best approximation polynomials for ζ_φ). This was essentially shown in [5, Corollary 6.1] as we remarked below Lemma 3.3. With (28) and (9) this means that

$$|M(\zeta)| \geq H(M)^{-2-1/\eta_k} \geq H(M)^{-2-\sigma} \geq H(M)^{-\gamma} > H(M)^{-3}$$

unless M coincides with some W_l, for γ the golden ratio. Hence the necessary inequality can only be satisfied if M equals some W_l from Lemma 3.3. However, by construction of $S_{k,j}$ we clearly cannot have $W_k|S_{k,j}$ or $W_{k+1}|S_{k,j}$. Thus $M = W_l$ for some $l \leq k-1$. For simplicity assume $l = k-1$, the proof works very similar otherwise. The relation (29) means in the context of Section 3 just

$$H(W_{j+1}) \asymp H(W_j)^{\eta_j}, \qquad j \geq 1.$$

Applied to $j = k$ and $j = k-1$ successively we infer

$$H(M) \asymp X^{\frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}\eta_k}}.$$

Thus since $\eta_j \geq 1/\sigma + o(1) \geq \gamma + o(1)$ for $j \geq 1$, with the identity $2\gamma^{-1} + \gamma^{-2} = \gamma$ we infer

$$|M(\zeta)| = |W_{k-1}(\zeta)| \asymp H(W_{k-1})^{-1-2\eta_{k-1}} \asymp X^{-\frac{2}{\eta_k} - \frac{1}{\eta_{k-1}\eta_k}} \gg X^{-\gamma-\epsilon}. \tag{65}$$

Since $M = W_l$ has degree two and $S_{k,j}$ degree three, the polynomial N is linear such that since ζ_φ is bad approximable we have

$$|N(\zeta)| \gg H(N)^{-1} \gg X^{-1}. \tag{66}$$

Combination of (65) and (66) yields

$$|S_{k,j}(\zeta)| = |M(\zeta)| \cdot |N(\zeta)| \gg X^{-\gamma-1-\epsilon}.$$

We obtain a contradiction to (64) for small ϵ since $\gamma + 1 < 3$. Hence the assumption was wrong and indeed $S_{k,j}$ must be irreducible for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. In view of (64) we derive left hand side of (15).

For the right hand side of (15), we need to show that for all large k and at least one $j = j(k) \in \{1, 2\}$, we have

$$|S'_{k,j}(\zeta)| \gg X^{1-\epsilon}. \tag{67}$$

This can be done very similarly to [17, Theorem 2.2] provided that

$$|W'_k(\zeta)| \asymp H(W_k), \tag{68}$$

analogous to $|P'_k(\zeta)| \asymp H(P_k)$ in [17]. We finally explain how (68) follows from [5, Lemma 6.1] and Lemma 3.3. It was shown in [5, Lemma 6.1] that the Galois conjugate β_k of α_k satisfies $|\beta_k - \alpha_k| \gg 1$. Hence $|\zeta - \beta_k| \geq |\alpha_k - \beta_k| - |\zeta - \alpha_k| \gg 1$ and further

$$\left|\frac{W_k(\zeta)}{\zeta - \beta_k}\right| \ll |W_k(\zeta)| \asymp H(W_k)^{-1-2\eta_k} \ll 1. \tag{69}$$

From (26) and (27) we infer

$$\left|\frac{W_k(\zeta)}{\zeta - \alpha_k}\right| \asymp H(W_k). \tag{70}$$

On the other hand, since $W_k(\zeta) = a_2\zeta^2 + a_1\zeta + a_0 = a_2(\zeta - \alpha_k)(\zeta - \beta_k)$, we readily check the identity

$$W_k'(\zeta) = \frac{W_k(\zeta)}{\zeta - \alpha_k} + \frac{W_k(\zeta)}{\zeta - \beta_k}. \tag{71}$$

Combination of (69), (70) and (71) and triangular inequality yield the claim (68). □

We refer to the heuristic arguments at the end of [17] why we strongly believe the exponents in (16) and (17) are optimal as well.

We now show the final claim (12) of Theorem 2.1. From Theorem 1.1 we see that $\widehat{w}_3^*(\zeta) \geq \widehat{w}_2^*(\zeta) = 2 + \sigma$ for any $\zeta = \zeta_\varphi$. We need to show the reverse inequality. Recall that since the first two successive minima functions are induced by polynomial multiples of the quadratic polynomials W_k from Lemma 3.3, the approximating functions arising from irreducible P of degree precisely three are essentially induced by the graph of $L_{3,3}^*(\zeta)$. We already used this fact in the proof of Theorem 2.2. On the other hand the best polynomial approximations of degree (at most) two are induced precisely by the W_k. Moreover the decay phases of $L_{3,3}^*$ are induced by the polynomials W_k as well, but when $L_{3,3}^*(q)$ equals approximately 0 the function $L_{3,3}^*$ begins to rise with (asymptotic on not too short interval) slope $1/3$ locally coinciding with the graphs of $L_{W_{k-1}E_t}$ for successive t, whereas $L_{W_k}^*(q)$ continues to have slope $-1/3$ until its local minimum at $q = b_k$ is reached where $L_{W_k}^*(b_k)$ equals approximately $b_k(\eta_k - 1)/(3(\eta_k + 1))$, up to $o(b_k)$. This is essentially shown in the proof of Theorem 5.2. Consider the auxiliary function $\tilde{\psi}_3^*(Q)$ given as the maximum of $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|H(P)| \leq Q^{\frac{1}{3}+\nu}, \qquad |P(\zeta)| \leq Q^{-1+\nu}$$

has an *irreducible* solution $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of degree at most 3 and let

$$\tilde{L}_3^*(q) = q\tilde{\psi}_3^*(Q), \qquad q = \log Q.$$

From the above facts we see that for any ζ_φ the pointwise minimum of the graphs of all $L_{W_k}^*(q)$ (in dimension three) for $k \geq 1$, see (36), essentially coincides with the graph of $\tilde{L}_3^*(q)$. Hence the local maxima of $\tilde{L}_3^*$ are given by the intersection of the rising part $-\log|W_k(\zeta)| + q$ of a given $L_{W_k}^*(q)$ with the falling phase $\log H(W_{k+1}) - q/3$ of the succeeding $L_{W_{k+1}}^*(q)$. By construction and (68), with the analogue formula to (40) for $\tilde{\psi}_3^*$ and $\tilde{L}_3^*$, these intersection points lead to the value $\widehat{w}_3^*(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_2^*(\zeta) = \widehat{w}_2(\zeta) = 2 + \sigma$. We have finished the proof of Theorem 2.1.

We conclude with the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Since the sequence $(\lambda_n(\zeta))_{n\geq 1}$ is non-increasing, the upper bound in (18) follows from (10) and the hypothesis $n \geq 3$. We have to prove the lower bound. From Theorem 1.1 we know that there exist P of degree two and arbitrarily large height $H(P)$ such that $|P(\zeta)| \leq H(P)^{-1-2/\sigma+\epsilon}$. For any such P the $n-1$ polynomials $P_0(T) = P, P_1(T) = TP(T), \ldots, P_{n-2}(T) = T^{n-2}P(T)$ have degree at most n and share the same

estimates since obviously $H(P_0) = H(P_1) = \cdots = H(P_{n-2})$ and $P_0(\zeta) \asymp_\zeta P_1(\zeta) \asymp_\zeta \cdots \asymp_\zeta P_{n-2}(\zeta)$. Hence

$$w_{n,n-1}(\zeta) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}.$$

With (40) we obtain

$$\underline{\psi}^*_{n,n-1} \leq \frac{(n-1)\sigma - 2}{2n(\sigma+1)}.$$

Hence

$$\underline{\psi}_{n,1} = -\overline{\psi}^*_{n,n+1} \leq \frac{n-1}{2}\underline{\psi}^*_{n,n-1} \leq \frac{(n-1)^2\sigma - 2(n-1)}{4n(\sigma+1)}.$$

Inserting in (39) we obtain the lower bound for λ_n and thus have established (18).

The identity (19) is true for $n \in \{1, 2, \}$ since since any ζ_φ has bounded partial quotients and $\lambda_2(\zeta_\varphi) = 1$ as well by Theorem 1.1. For $n \geq 3$, the identity follows from (18) if and only if $\sigma = 0$. We are left to prove (20). In [22, Corollary 2.14] it was shown that for any real number the conditions $w_1(\zeta) < 2$ and $w_2(\zeta) < \infty$ imply $\lambda_n(\zeta) \leq 1/\widehat{w}_2(\zeta)$ for large n. The explicit lower bound $w_2(\zeta) + 1$ for the suitable values of n can be derived by looking closer at [22, Theorem 2.9], from which [22, Corollary 2.14] originated. For ζ_φ with $\sigma_\varphi > 0$, we readily check the conditions are satisfied, and (20) follows by inserting the corresponding values from Theorem 1.1. □

References

[1] V. I. Bernik. Application of Hausdorff dimension in the theory of Diophantine approximations. *Acta Arith.* 42 (1983), 219–253 (in Russian). English transl. in Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. 140 (1988), 15–44.

[2] Y. Bugeaud. Approximation by algebraic numbers. *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*, Cambridge 2004.

[3] Y. Bugeaud. On simultaneous rational approximation to a real number and its integral powers. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 60 (2010), 2165–2182.

[4] Y. Bugeaud and A. Dujella. Root separation for irreducible integer polynomials. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 43 (2011), 1239–1244.

[5] Y. Bugeaud and M. Laurent. Exponents of Diophantine approximation and Sturmian continued fractions. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 55 (2005), no. 3, 773–804.

[6] Y. Bugeaud and J. Schleischitz. On uniform approximation to real numbers. *Acta Arith.* 175 (2016), 255–268.

[7] J. Cassaigne. Limit values of the recurrence sequence of Sturmian sequences. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 218 (1999), 3–12.

[8] K. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry.* Wiley (New York, 1989).

[9] S. Fischler. Spectres pour l'approximation d'un nombre réel et de son carré. *C.R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 339 , no. 10 (2004), 679–682.

[10] S. Fischler. Palindromic prefixes and Diophantine approximation. Monatshefte Math. 151, no. 1 (2007), 1–87.

[11] V. Jarník. Zum Khintchinschen "Ubertragungssatz". *Trav. Inst. Math. Tbilissi* 3 (1938), 193–212.

[12] A.Y. Khintchine, Über eine Klasse linearer diophantischer Approximationen, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* 50 (1926), 706–714.

[13] W. J. Leveque. On Mahler's U-numbers, *J. London Math. Soc.* 28 (1953), 220–229.

[14] D. Roy, Approximation to real numbers by cubic algebraic integers I, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 88 (2004), 42–62.

[15] D. Roy. On the continued fraction expansion of a class of numbers. Diophantine Approximation, Festschrift fúr Wolfgang Schmidt, 347–361 *Dev. Math.* 16 (2008), Vienna.
[16] D. Roy. On two exponents of approximation related to a real number and its square. *Canad. J. Math.* 59 (2007), 211–224.
[17] J. Schleischitz. Approximation to an extremal number, its square and its cube. *to appear in Pacific Math. J.*
[18] J. Schleischitz. On the spectrum of Diophantine approximation constants. *Mathematika* 62 (2016), 79–100.
[19] J. Schleischitz. Two estimates concerning classical Diophantine approximation constants, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 84/3-4 (2014), 415–437.
[20] J. Schleischitz. Generalizations of a result of Jarník on simultaneous approximation. *to appear in Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory, arXiv:* 1410.6697.
[21] J. Schleichitz. Some notes on the regular graph defined by Schmidt and Summerer and uniform approximation. *to appear in JP J. Algebra Number Theory Appl., arXiv:* 1601.00842.
[22] J. Schleischitz. On uniform approximation to successive powers of a real number, *to appear in Indag. Math., arXiv:* 1603.09236.
[23] J. Schleischitz. On the discrepancy between best and uniform approximation. *arXiv:* 1701.01108.
[24] W.M. Schmidt, L. Summerer. Parametric geometry of numbers and applications, *Acta Arith.* 140 (2009), no. 1, 67–91.
[25] W.M. Schmidt, L. Summerer. Diophantine approximation and parametric geometry of numbers. *Monatsh. Math.* 169 (2013), 51–104.
[26] W.M. Schmidt, L. Summerer. Simultaneous approximation to three numbers. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 3 (2013), 84–107.
[27] E. Wirsing. Approximation mit algebraischen Zahlen beschränkten Grades. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 206 (1961), 67–77.